MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS 1420 EAST SIXTH AVE. HELENA, MONTANA 59620

(406) 444-2452

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Fur Farm, Game Bird Farm, Zoo/Menagerie, Shooting Preserve

PART 1. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

Project Title: Larry Schultz Fur Farm d.b.a. Schultz Fur Farm

Application Date: June 18, 2014

Name, Address and Phone Number: Larry Schultz, 5700 Romunstad Road, Roy, MT 59471 (701) 570-6964





Description of Project:

This project is an application for a commercial fur farm for the purpose of raising and selling bobcats to sell in the commercial fur industry. The facility is located approximately 6 miles southwest of Roy, MT at 5700 Romunstad Road in Fergus County in T18N R21E Section 30.

The overall outside dimension and construction for the animal facility is approximately 150 feet by 140 feet. The animals will be housed in separate pens inside the facility. The inside enclosures are divided into several equal rectangular pens of approximately 60 feet by 6 feet that will be used for breeding pens. The breading pens are 30 inches off the ground, are covered by a 10 foot wide roof, and are divided by 10 foot alley ways. There will also be a barn constructed with a dimension of approximately 120 feet by 30 feet for the purposes of a weaning barn for the bobcat kittens. There is also an existing barn on the property that will be used for the purposes of food preparation and storage. The food preparation and storage barn will be outside of the main enclosure. The main enclosure fence will be a combination of 8 foot high board and bat fencing on the north and west side, and 8 foot tall chain link on the south and east sides. There will be a 38 inch metal flashing affixed to the top of all of the exterior fencing to prevent climbing of any ingress or egress attempts. There will be a 10 foot wide 8 foot tall gate on the west side of the exterior perimeter fence. There will be two 6 foot gates to the barn within the enclosure. The bobcats are kept in the breading pens and weaning pens at all times. The bobcats are not allowed to move freely inside the main exterior fence. The pens are 4 foot by 6 foot with a 2 foot by 4 foot nesting box attached. The pens are constructed of a poly coated 10 gage mesh wire. The facility will be located on property owned by the applicant and about 1/8 mile from the residence. The bobcats are vaccinated against diseases such as distemper annually and are protected against parasites three times a year with Ivermectin in their food.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: Fergus County commissioners, Fergus County Sheriff's Office, United States Department of Agriculture, Montana Department of Health and Human Services, Montana Department of Livestock and Montana Land Reliance.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Table 1. Potential impact on physical environment.

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below Or On Attached Pages
Unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources.				Х		
2. Terrestrial or aquatic life and/or habitats.				х		
3. Introduction of new species into an area.				x		
4. Vegetation covers quantity and quality.			x			X
Water quality, quantity and distribution (surface or groundwater)				х		
6. Existing water right or reservation.				х		
7. Geology and soil quality, stability and moisture.				x		
8. Air quality or objectionable odors.			x			X
9. Historical and archaeological sites.				X		
Demands on environmental resources of land, water, air and energy.			X			х
I1. Aesthetics			X			

Comments:

- 4) The area where the pen will be historically was part of a hay pasture so the 150 foot by 140 foot pen is now cleared of vegetation, a minor impact.
- 8) There could be an increase in smell of bobcat urine and feces dependent on the waste management practice. At this time the applicant plans to spread the manure over his hay pasture for disposal.
- 10) Water from the wells used for the cats will be minimal due to the fact that most of the cast fluid intake comes from their diet. Energy used for food preparation would be the only extra energy expended.

Table 2. Potential impacts on human environment:

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below Or On Attached Pages
Social structures and cultural diversity.				х		
Changes in existing public benefits provided by wildlife populations and/or habitat.				х		
3. Local and state tax base and tax revenue.			x			X
4. Agricultural production.			x			X
5. Human health.				х		
Quantity and distribution of community and person income.				х		
7. Access to and quality of recreational activities.				X		
Locally adopted environmental plans and goals (ordinances).			:	x		
Distribution and density of population and housing.				X		
10. Demands for government services.			х			X
11. Industrial and/or commercial activity.				х		

Comments:

- 3) This business venture will increase the tax revenue in the county due to new resident and a new agriculture business in the county.
- 4) This will increase agriculture production due to the bobcats being raised for fur production then being sold. This is a form of agriculture.
- 10) A slight increase in demand for service by FWP regional staff due to annual license review, inspection, and fur tagging

Does the proposed action involve potential risks or adverse effects, which are uncertain but extremely harmful, if they were to occur?

-There are no potential or adverse effects that would pose any substantial impact on the environment.

Does the proposed action have impacts that are individually minor, but cumulatively significant or potentially significant?

-There are no impacts associated with this project that taken collectively will have a substantial or potentially substantial impact.

Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives (including the no action alternative) to the proposed action when alternatives are reasonably available and prudent to consider. Include a discussion of how the alternatives would be implemented:

- 1. No action alternative. Under the no action alternative the facility would not be licensed.
- 2. Preferred Alternative: The facility is granted a license to raise bobcats commercially.

List proposed mitigation measures (stipulations) for license:

- -The outside perimeter gate and each individual interior gate must be padlock at all times.
- -No trapping of Fur Bearing animals within or along the property boundary.
- -Tagging of bobcat furs must be performed by FWP Warden.
- -The licensed Fur Farm will be open for inspection on a scheduled basis or at other times deemed necessary by FWP.
- -A contingency plan must be in place to address any ingress or egress issues with the bobcats.

EA prepared by: Shawn Briggs

Date completed: <u>7/18/2014</u>

PART 3. DECISION

License approved

Recommendation and justification concerning preparation of EIS:

No EIS is needed for this project because there are few minor impacts predicted by the licensing of this business and the minor impacts can be mitigated below significance as described in 12.2.432 ARM. Describe public involvement, if any:

This EA has been posted on the FWP state web site making it available for public comment from July 23, 2014, to August 29, 2014 as required by department guidelines.

Recommendation for license approval:

Comments may be e-mailed	l to Shawn Briggs at sbriggs@mt.g	ov or mailed to:
		FWP Lewistown Area Office
Wildlife Manager	Date	Attn: Schultz Fur Farm
-		215 Aztec Drive
		PO Box 938
Warden Captain	Date	Lewistown, MT 59457